

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRS	NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/842,487	04/25/01	CINO		[Y]	10873.447USD
		- bathatan ma a r			EXAMINER
OUGLAS P. M	UELLER	MMC2/1:	.07	MTTC:	 √F" T
MERCHANT & G M.O. BOX 290				ART UN	IT PAPER NUMBER
IINNEAPOLIS		103		2822	
				DATE MAIL	·
					11/07/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/842,487	ONO ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		James Mitchell	0000				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address				
- Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any r	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ensions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). O period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set or extended per	737 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re nication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on 25 April 2001					
2a)	TI) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	or allowance except for formal matter	ers, prosecution as to the merits is				
1	on of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>22 and 23</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[_	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>22 and 23</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) 🔲 (Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requirement.					
Application	on Papers						
	he specification is objected to by the Ex						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a)				
11) <u> </u>	ne proposed drawing correction filed or	າ is: a)	approved by the Examiner.				
	if approved, corrected drawings are require	ed in reply to this Office action.	•				
	he oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner.					
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)[JAII b) Some * c) None of:						
1	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2.	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3.	 Copies of the certified copies of th 	ne priority documents have been red	ceived in this National Stage				
14) 🗌 Acł	knowledgment is made of a claim for do	omestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 1	19(e) (to a provisional application)				
a) [The translation of the foreign langua knowledgment is made of a claim for do	ge provisional application has been	a manager at				
Attachment(s))	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	120 and/01 121.				
2) U Notice o	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9- tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper N	48) 5) Nation of 6	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/842,487

Art Unit: 2822

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed April 25, 2001.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 4. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 5. Claim 22 recites the limitation "said terminal electrode" in line 31-32, and claim 23 recites the limitation "the element" in line 35. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsubishi (JP 63186448).

Application/Control Number: 09/842,487

Art Unit: 2822

8. Mitsubishi discloses a semiconductor device (title) with a metal ball formed on the element (Fig. 1b) comprising a region for probe needle (defined by area on terminal not covered by metal ball) and a region for a metal ball (16) formed at the tip of a metal wire (15).

9. In regards to claim 22, a product by process characteristic such as the bonding method is given no patentable weight in determining patentability of the final device structure. Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed Cir. 1985). Case law makes it is clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in "product by process" or not.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Huang et al. (U.S 6,242,813), Shiue et. al. (U.S 5,700,735).

The prior art discloses in Huang and Shiue the use of a metal ball attached to a wire that is bonded to a terminal electrode.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 305-0244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead can be reached on (703) 308-4940. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 09/842,487

Art Unit: 2822

Page 4

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-3230 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

jmm October 21, 2001

CARL WHÎTEHEAD, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800